Casca3e07:07-00000090599-SIDobourouemetrat 5 Filleedt0011/1127/200707PagFeagleoft4of4 JEROME C. ROTH (SBN 159483) 1 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 2 560 Mission Street Twenty-Seventh Floor 3 San Francisco, CA 94105-2907 (415) 512-4000 Telephone: 4 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077 ierome.roth@mto.com 5 Attorneys for Defendant 6 LG. PHILIPS LCD AMERICA, INC. 7 8 9 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 Candace Rowlette, a Florida resident; and CASE NO. C 07-00039 (SI) 13 Michael Francis Ayers, a Massachusetts resident, on behalf of themselves and all others STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF 14 **TIME** similarly situated, 15 Honorable Susan Illston Plaintiff, 16 VS. 17 LG. Philips LCD Co. Ltd., LG. Philips LCD America, Inc.; Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.; 18 NEC Corporation; NEC Electronics America, Inc.; NEC LCD Technologies Ltd.; Hitachi 19 Ltd; Hitachi Displays, Ltd.; Hitachi Electronics Devices (USA), Inc.; Hitachi America Ltd.; 20 International Display Technology Co., Ltd.; International Display Technology USA Inc; 21 Sanyo Epson Imaging Devices Corporation; Sharp Corporation; Sharp Electronics 22 Corporation; Toshiba Corporation; Toshiba Matsushita Display Technology Co. Ltd.; AU 23 Optronics Corp.; AU Optronics Corporation America; Chi Mei Optoelectronics; Chi Mei 24 Optoelectronics USA, Inc.; Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd.; Hannstar Display Corporation, 25 Defendants. 26

STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME CASE NO. CV 07-00039 (SI)

27

28

1	WHEREAS plaintiff filed a complaint in the above-captioned case on or about
2	January 4, 2007;
3	WHEREAS plaintiff alleges antitrust violations by manufacturers of Liquid
4	Crystal Display ("LCD") products;
5	WHEREAS more than fifteen complaints have been filed to date in federal district
6	courts throughout the United States by plaintiffs purporting to bringing class actions on behalf of
7	indirect purchasers alleging antitrust violations by manufacturers of LCD products (collectively,
8	"the LCD Cases");
9	WHEREAS there is a motion pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict
10	Litigation to transfer the LCD Cases to the Northern District of California for coordinated or
11	consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407;
12	WHEREAS plaintiff anticipates the possibility of Consolidated Amended
13	Complaints in the LCD Cases;
14	WHEREAS plaintiff and LG Philips LCD America, Inc. ("LPL America") have
15	agreed that an orderly schedule for any response to the pleadings in the LCD Cases would be
16	more efficient for the parties and for the Court;
17	WHEREAS plaintiff agrees that the deadline for LPL America to respond to the
18	Complaint shall be extended until the earlier of the following two dates: (1) forty-five days after
19	the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after
20	plaintiff provides written notice to LPL America that he does not intend to file a Consolidated
21	Amended Complaint, provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case
22	management conference in the MDL transferee court in this case;
23	WHEREAS plaintiff further agrees that this extension is available, without further
24	stipulation with counsel for plaintiff, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in writing of
25	their intention to join this extension;
26	WHEREAS this Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by LPL America or any
27	defendant of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal or subject
28	

Casca3e07:07-000000959-SIDocumentrat 5 Fileed10011/112/120007Pageageo84of 4

1	matter jurisdiction, insufficiency of process, insufficiency of service of process, or improper		
2	venue.		
3	PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANT LPL AMERICA, BY AND THROUGH THEIR		
4	RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD, HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:		
5	1. The deadline for LPL America to respond to the Complaint shall be		
6	extended until the earlier of the following two dates (1) forty-five days after the filing of a		
7	Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after the plaintiff		
8	provides written notice that he does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint,		
9	provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the		
10	MDL transferee court in this case.		
11	2. This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for		
12	plaintiff or further order of the Court, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in writing of		
13	their intention to join this extension.		
14	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
15	15		
16	16 DATED: January 12, 2007 Respectfully	submitted,	
17	17 MUNGER, T	OLLES & OLSON LLP	
18	18		
19	19 By:	/s/ Jerome C. Roth	
20	20 I G PI	JEROME C. ROTH Attorneys for Defendant HILIPS LCD AMERICA, INC.	
21		HILIFS ECD AMERICA, INC.	
22			
23	23 Jeremy J. Calsyn		
24	Lee F. Berger CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP		
25	2000 B 1 1 1 1 NWY		
26	TO 1 1 (000) 054 1500		
27	` '		
28	28		

Case 3:07-000899-S9-SID footment of 5 Filed 0011/112/20007Page 4:0f 4 DATED: January 12, 2007 FURTH LEHMANN & GRANT LLP By: /s/ Jon T. King MICHAEL P. LEHMANN THOMAS P. DOVE

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED:

Dated:

Honorable Susan Illston

Judge of the United States District Court

CHRISTOPHER L. LEBSOCK

JON T. KING Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CANDACE ROWLETTE and MICHAEL FRANCIS AYERS

CERTIFICATION

I, Jerome C. Roth, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to file this Stipulation For Extension Of Time. In compliance with General Order 45.X.B, I hereby attest that Jon T. King has concurred in this filing.

STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME CASE NO. C 07-00039 (SI)